

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/717,871	11/19/2003	Hiroshi Suzuki	3679.002ADIV	3679.002ADIV 9347	
24040	7590 07/27/2006		EXAMINER		
DENNIS G. LAPOINTE			SELLERS, ROBERT E		
LAPOINTE I PO BOX 129	LAW GROUP, PL 4		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
TARPON SPRINGS, FL 34688-1294			1712	*	
			DATE MAILED: 07/27/2000	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/717,871	SUZUKI ET AL.	SUZUKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit			
Robert Sellers	1712			

	Robert Sellers	1712	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 18 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires</li></ol>	ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	s of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con			ecause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	w);	•	
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li></ul>			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	empliant Amendment	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		,	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidate	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered and necessary and
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ul> <li>11.          \( \sum \) The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See the attachement.</li> </ul>	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
		Robert Sellers Primary Examiner	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Application/Control Number: 10/717,871 Page 2

Art Unit: 1712

1. The amendment after Final rejection filed July 18, 2006 has been denied entry because the modification of the maximum molar ratio of tetrakisphenol compound to epoxy group of the epoxy resin to 0.025:1 from 0.1:1 claimed in the amendment filed May 12, 2006 is not supported by the original claims nor the specification. According to the calculation presented on page 7 in the Remarks section of the amendment, the UVR-6410 base resin of Example 21 on page 58 has an epoxy equivalent weight of from about 180-200.

- 2. There is no substantiation anywhere in the original claims or the specification for the epoxy equivalent weight range for UVR-6410, particularly page 12, the second full paragraph wherein epoxy resins are described, and page 29, Example 2 wherein UVR-6410 is first mentioned. There is no indication that UVR-6410 is actually a diglycidyl ether of bisphenol A. If the lower epoxy equivalent weight of 180 g/mole for UVR-6410 is confirmed, the newly claimed upper limit of 0.025:1 is substantiated by Example 21.
- 3. The translation for Japanese Patent No. 7-74260 B cannot be validated until a copy of the original Japanese document along with a certified translation is submitted. A search for the Japanese patent by the number associated with the abstract did not uncover a Japanese patent or equivalent cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed November 19, 2003. The epoxy equivalent weight for the cresol novolac epoxy resin of 178 in Example 2 of the unverified translation and the assumed number of 10 epoxy groups cannot be confirmed in the absence of documented evidence.

Art Unit: 1712

It is unclear whether the contribution of the presence of 50 parts by weight epoxy resin

(A) to the molar ratio has been considered in the calculation for the molar ratio of tetrakisphenol compound to epoxy group.

4. The deletion of the lack of use of mono-substituted dicyandiamide from independent claim 1 in the amendment would have overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection had it been entered.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Sellers whose telephone number is (571) 272-1093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Sellers Primary Examiner Art Unit 1712